



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Magnien, however, does considerably less than justice to the rival theory that the Greek future is in the main an aorist subjunctive. Most of the objections which he raises may be easily met. The predominance of the middle inflection in the Greek future may stand in some relation to the fact that in Sanskrit the *s*-aorist has middle inflection more frequently than the other aorists have. The fact that many Greek verbs have an *s*-future but no *s*-aorist may simply mean that the *s*-future (originally aorist subjunctive) spread more rapidly than the corresponding *s*-aorist indicative because there was no rival future formation to be crowded off the field. The first aorist subjunctive was preferred to the second aorist subjunctive for the reason that the short thematic vowel of the former was more easily associated with the other indicative forms.

Our author seems not to appreciate at all the positive evidence for the subjunctive origin of the *s*-future. He discusses the extensive confusion in Homer between future indicative and aorist subjunctive, but he does not realize that such a state of affairs in our earliest document indicates a close relationship between the two formations. He does not explain how Latin *faxo*, which he regards as a thematic indicative of a desiderative formation, can have a non-thematic optative like *faxim*.

Whether the contribution of the Indo-European desideratives to the Greek future was small or large, Magnien is certainly wrong in trying to find a desiderative force in the future of historic times whenever the context will permit such an interpretation. He regards the future infinitive after verbs of hoping, promising, etc., as desiderative; *Iliad* ix. 371 (ἐἴ τινα πον Δαναῶν ἐτι ἔλπεται ἐξαπατήσῃν) means "s'il a dans la pensée le désir de tromper encore quelqu'un des Grecs," and he gets the word *désir* from the tense of the infinitive rather than from ἔλπεται. Similarly *Iliad* i. 296 (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγ' ἐτι σοι πείσῃσθαι δῶ) means "car j'ai dans la pensée que je ne veux plus t'obeir." Such forced interpretations as these vitiate a large part of the semantic classification.

E. H. STURTEVANT

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The Clown in Greek Literature after Aristophanes. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of Princeton University in June 1911 by CHARLES HENRY HAILE. Princeton, 1913. Pp. viii+40.

The House-Door on the Ancient Stage. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of Princeton University by W. W. MOONEY. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co., 1914. Pp. 104.

Der Emporkömmling. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie. Von ERNST MEYER. Giessen, 1913. Pp. 94.

"The buffoonery of modern comedy and farce is derived from the Italian *commedia dell' arte*, the child of the Roman mime and the grand-child of the Greek." This is one of several loose generalizations in which Mr. Haile reveals his passive adherence to the theories of Dieterich and Reich; in the latter's *Der Mimus* he has so great confidence that he has "simply used the work . . . , not referring to Athenaeus and other authorities." Without committing himself to elusive Pulcinellas, the author might have established the thesis that certain sharply defined characteristics in Euelpides and Dicaeopolis recur in Ergasilus and several other slaves and parasites of the New Comedy. By careful definition at the start and cautious procedure in the course of his study he might have strengthened appreciably the bond that unites Old and New Comedy. Instead of doing this, however, Mr. Haile, having quoted Süss's description of the *bomolochos*—a description that itself is almost too broad and inclusive to serve as a satisfactory basis for any scientific procedure—admits as evidence of bomolochy in the New Comedy almost any variety of comic jest. For example, we are told that "in Aristophanes a prominent function of the clown was that of playing off an ἀλαζών or similar character. In the New Comedy a large share of his humor consists in playing off or bantering others, though these are not all ἀλαζόνες by any means." It will be observed that by this very nimble transition practically any form of banter becomes bomolochy, and the sisters in the *Bacchides* immediately appear in Mr. Haile's argument as lineal descendants of the clown, for they "mock the irascible old men, whom they call 'sheep,' making sarcastic remarks about their value as live-stock, and finally roping them in." By such a method little room is left for the spontaneous generation of comic wit and humor. The reader, therefore, must make his own precise definition of bomolochy and sift out from a heterogeneous mass the relevant material; for the collection of this material we are grateful to Mr. Haile.

Mr. Mooney's conclusions are not novel; the essential results of his study have long been available in the brief comment of Dziatzko on *Phormio* 840. The statement of Dziatzko, however, is not supported by any array of evidence, and it is gratifying to find that a collection and interpretation of the pertinent passages confirm a current view. The thesis discusses the meaning of *ianua*, *fores*, *ostium*, the question whether the house-door opened outward, the procedure of knocking at entrance, the problem whether in opening the door from within a warning knock was given. Throughout the study the vocabulary is interpreted, and elaborate lists of words, with statistics, conclude the paper. In connection with these lists we miss a reference to Feyerabend, *De verbis Plautinis personarum motum in scaena exprimentibus* (Marburg, 1910). In his interpretation of *Most.* 505 ff. Mr. Mooney seems not to have interpreted the text and interpretation of Leo. Perhaps we may mildly protest against the array of statistics and the ideas at the beginning of the fifth chapter: "the amount of coming and going in a play may form

a rough gauge of the action in it," but if we are to have such gauges applied to the drama, we prefer the weighing-scene in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes.

Ribbeck's fruitful ethological studies are continued by Meyer in his sketch of the parvenu. Ribbeck, in the fashion of Theophrastus, made dominant inner qualities the subjects of several essays; the ἀλαζών may be cook or soldier; ἀλαζονεία is Ribbeck's theme. Meyer's treatment and choice of his theme are different; the parvenu reveals a variety of inner qualities and external features, some of which are not his exclusive property. Furthermore, Meyer has divided his material with reference to the literary γένος involved, instead of making the dominant characteristics his main headings. The bearings of the literary γένος on the delineation of the character is certainly very important, but one misses the clearer synthesis of Ribbeck's essays. The *novus homo* in politics as well as the pretentious νεόπλουτοι in social life are followed through the literature from Anacreon to Claudian. The character in its literary form is fixed in the Greek sources; Meyer admits as a possible Roman contribution the *cena noviciorum*, but even this may easily have appeared in Menippus and his followers. Actual development in the portrayal is hard to trace; indeed, the completeness of the first portrait, in Anacreon's account of Artemon, is remarkable; even the parvenu freedmen of the early empire are foreshadowed in the people of a Utopian city in Cratinus' *Seriphians*. It is interesting to note that a feature of Aristophanes' realistic portrait of Hyperbolus becomes conventional in the later treatment of the type; in general, perhaps, the ultimate hardening of the character is the issue of abusive caricature of historical personages. Change of name to disguise humble origin, and fondness for high-sounding nomenclature are among the most pervasive characteristics. Here and there a few details may be questioned: has Asconius' comment (*Div. ad. Verrem* 15) some bearing on the identification of the πολυπρόσωπον δράμα in Lucian *Nig.* 58? Meyer denies that Thales in the second mime of Herondas is a *nauta libidinosus*, and regards him as a typical *cerdo fortunatus*; but such sharp differentiation is quite impossible: the typical qualities of the *mercator* and *nauta libidinosus* are prominent, though the *Emporkömmling* may be included in the portrayal; why may not the realistic portraiture of the Hellenistic period combine features of both characters in one individual? In general, the essay contains material of value to the student of character-types and of ancient life.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Inscriptiones Graecae,¹ *Editio Minor*, Vols. II and III, Pars I, Fasc.

I. Ed. Kirchner, Berlin, 1913.

Students of Greek history and epigraphy will welcome most heartily the new publication of the Attic decrees which is being edited by Professor

¹ For criticisms of details in these volumes cf. above, pp. 417 ff.